

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-5, and 27-36 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the above-amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Roberts et al. (US Patent No. 6,754,693), hereafter “Roberts.” Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is defective because Roberts fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites:

“A connection accepting system, comprising: client terminals connected to a network; a first server for accepting connection requests from said client terminals through said network, wherein said first server includes a priority order setting unit which, upon receiving a first connection request from a first client terminal of said client terminals, sets a connection priority for said first client terminal and transmits data conveying said connection priority to said first client terminal; and a connection managing unit for allowing connection of said client terminals according to connection priority upon receiving a second connection request from a second client terminal of said client terminals after said first connection request; said first client terminal displays connection priority information, based on said data conveying said connection priority; and a second server for executing a process according to requests from said client terminals, wherein said first server accepts said first and second connection requests as connection requests for said second server and, when said connection managing unit allows connection of said first and second client terminals, connects said first and second client terminals with said second server.”

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the above-referenced Final Office Action, the Examiner equates the “second server” of claim 1 to the firewall 192 of Roberts. Office Action, page 7, item d. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s analysis of Roberts and submit that Roberts’ firewall does not

provide the functionality of the claimed “second server.” Rather, the firewall 192 operates in a conventional manner to selectively stop incoming/outgoing network traffic. It should also be noted that the Examiner also alleges, in a contradictory manner, that the claimed operation of the “second server” is disclosed in column 7, lines 36-50 and column 8, lines 25-42 of Roberts. However, these cited sections of Roberts do not disclose any information regarding the firewall 192, which the Examiner has equated with the claimed “second server.” Clarification of the Examiner’s position is requested.

Regarding claim 3, Roberts does not disclose, *inter alia*, “wherein a program **for automatically executing said second connection request again** is transmitted to said client terminal to which said order of connection has been set.” Contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, none of Roberts’ applets 22, 30, 34 provide this functionality.

Regarding dependent claim 4, the sections of Roberts cited by the Examiner with regard to the display of the claimed “connection-order information” refer to the display of information on Roberts’ second computer 24, not Roberts’ user computer 12.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Roberts’ server 20 does not include the claimed “connection-number monitoring unit.”

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Date: March 23, 2007

John A. Merecki
Reg. No.: 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)